Isolation and contact tracing can tip the scale to containment of COVID-19 in populations with social distancing

Mirjam E. Kretzschmar[1#], Ganna Rozhnova[1], Michiel van Boven[1]

[1] Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

corresponding author:

Mirjam E. Kretzschmar

Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care

University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht

Email: m.e.e.kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl

Phone: +31 88 75 687 61

Abstract

Background: Novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has extended its range of transmission in all parts of the world, with substantial variation in rates of transmission and severity of associated disease. Many countries have implemented social distancing as a measure to control further spread.

Methods: We evaluate whether and under which conditions containment or slowing down COVID-19 epidemics are possible by isolation and contact tracing in settings with various levels of social distancing. We use a stochastic transmission model in which every person generates novel infections according to a probability distribution that is affected by the incubation period distribution (time from infection to symptoms), distribution of the latent period (time from infection to onset of infectiousness), and overall transmissibility. The model distinguishes between close contacts (e.g., within a household) and other contacts in the population. Social distancing affects the number of contacts outside but not within the household.

Findings: The proportion of asymptomatic or unascertained cases has a strong impact on the controllability of the disease. If the proportion of asymptomatic infections is larger than 30%, contact tracing and isolation cannot achieve containment for an R_0 of 2.5. Achieving containment by social distancing requires a reduction of numbers of non-household contacts by around 90%. Depending on the realized level of contact reduction, tracing and isolation of only household contacts, or of household and non-household contacts are necessary to reduce the effective reproduction number to below 1. A combination of social

distancing with isolation and contact tracing leads to synergistic effects that increase the prospect of containment.

Interpretation: Isolation and contact tracing can be an effective means to slow down epidemics, but only if the majority of cases are ascertained. In a situation with social distancing, contact tracing can act synergistically and tip the scale towards containment, and can therefore be a tool for controlling COVID-19 epidemics as part of an exit strategy from current lockdown measures.

Funding: This research was partly funded by ZonMw project number 91216062.

Author summary

As of 2 April 2020, the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has spread to more than 170 countries and has caused over 850,000 confirmed cases of COVID-19. In the absence of effective medicines and vaccines, the preventive measures are limited to social distancing, isolation of confirmed and suspected cases and identification of their contacts. Using a transmission model, we evaluated the impact of social distancing, isolation and contact tracing on slowing down or even containing COVID-19 epidemics. We investigated how various combinations of social distancing, isolation, and contact tracing reduce the effective reproduction number, and what is needed to achieve the critical threshold of a reproduction number below 1. We estimated the impact of combinations of measures on epidemic growth rate and doubling time for the number of infections. We find that under realistic assumptions on the level of social distancing, additional isolation and contact tracing are needed for stopping the epidemic. Whether quarantining only household contacts is sufficient, depends on levels of social distancing and timeliness of tracing and isolation. Our analyses, based on best understanding of the epidemiology of COVID-19, highlight that even if social distancing is in place, isolation and contact tracing at least of household contacts are needed to stop the epidemic, and these additional measures help to delay and lower the epidemic peak. Therefore, isolation and contact tracing will be important tools for enabling exiting of currently implemented social distancing measures.

Introduction

As of early April 2020, the number of infections of the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) is still increasing at an exponential rate in many countries, while the virus is expanding its range to all parts of the world. There are no registered effective medicines, treatment options are mainly supportive, and there are no vaccines available, limiting preventive measures mainly to social distancing combined with isolation of infected persons and those that have high likelihood of being infected, for instance because they have been traced as contacts of infected persons [1, 2]. However, recently it was questioned by high-ranked officials of the World Health Organization (WHO) whether social distancing or lockdowns are sufficient to stop the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak (https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-who-ryan/lockdowns-not-enough-to-defeat-coronavirus-whos-ryan-idUSKBN2190FM). Possibly, additional measures are needed, for example active tracing of contacts in combination with isolation of infected contacts. Also, such measures will be important in the context of exit strategies, i.e. once social distancing measures are reduced or lifted, as has been suggested recently [3]. It is unclear, how effective such combinations of interventions can be in populations with social distancing in place.

To what extent local containment or local slowing down of an epidemic by isolation and contact tracing is successful depends on the fraction of infections that remain asymptomatic or have mild disease, and on the infectiousness before the onset of symptoms [4, 5]. It is known that a high probability of asymptomatic infection, a high proportion of transmission occurring before the onset of symptoms, a long delay between case finding and isolation, and high overall transmissibility all factor in negatively in the likelihood that an outbreak can

be contained [6-9]. For SARS-CoV-2, evidence indicates that a high fraction of infected persons is infectious before they show symptoms (up to 50%), that a substantial fraction of infections may be asymptomatic or show only mild symptoms (up to 80%), and that the epidemic doubling time in the absence of interventions is approximately one week or perhaps even less [5, 10-16]. On the other hand, it is also reported that with intensive contact tracing it may be possible to trace the majority (>80%) of secondary infections [17].

Here we provide model-based analyses of the impact of isolation and contact tracing in a setting with various levels of social distancing measures, using varying levels of the effectiveness and timeliness of contact tracing. It is important to consider the impact of each of these interventions in isolation but also in combination, as it is well known that each intervention that reduces transmission in the population (i.e. reduces the reproduction number) is expected to increase the effectiveness of additional interventions in a synergistic manner [18]. We show how those measures impact on the cumulative numbers of infecteds during an outbreak and compare with recent outbreak data from various countries [19].

We focus on conditions that make containment of an early epidemic possible, but also on the impact of isolation and contact tracing when containment is not possible, or in an exit phase from social distancing. In a population with social distancing in place, we investigate what the additional impact of isolation and contact tracing can be for reaching containment or slowing down the spread. We report effective reproduction number, the (exponential) rate of increase, and the doubling time of the epidemic for scenarios with various combinations of interventions. Considering that the capacity of healthcare systems is

limited, it is important to assess which interventions are most effective in slowing down the rate of increase of healthcare demand during an ongoing outbreak. As it is likely that, on the one hand, isolation and contact tracing will be more effective in close contact settings with well-defined contacts (household, workplace) than in the community (commuting, public spaces), while, on the other hand, the potential impact of household interventions on the epidemic could be smaller, we stratify the analyses by transmission setting (henceforth called household and non-household) [8]. As many of the relevant epidemiological and intervention parameters are still quite uncertain, or may be variable in different settings, we focus throughout on a systematic analysis of the relation between key parameters for timeliness and completeness of contact tracing and main outcomes such as the effective reproduction number and the epidemic growth rate.

Methods

We modify a model that was developed earlier for similar aims in another context [8]. The stochastic model describes an epidemic in its early phase as a branching process. Starting from a small set of initially infected individuals, the model calculates the numbers of latently infected persons, infectious persons, and persons that are diagnosed and isolated in time steps of one day. Latent infection, infectivity during the infectious period, and daily contact rates are quantified using distributions taken from the literature (Table 1). We distinguish between household contacts and non-household contacts, which differ in the risk of infection and the delay and effectiveness of tracing and isolation. Intervention effectiveness is determined by the daily probability of being diagnosed during the infectious period (Table 2). Furthermore, intervention effectiveness depends on the delays in tracing household and non-household contacts, respectively, and the proportions of contacts can be found and isolated. We assume that isolation is perfect, i.e. that isolated persons cannot transmit any longer. The model is described by a set of difference equations, and allows for explicit computation of the basic reproduction number R_0 and the effective reproduction number under interventions R_e. The model was coded in Mathematica 12.1.

Natural history

We assume that the latent period lasts between 4 and 6 days. Individuals then become infectious for at most 10 days. Infectivity is high at the beginning of the infectious period and decays to low levels during these 10 days (Figure S1a). The probability of symptoms onset increases during the first 4 days of the infectious period, thereby influencing the daily probability of diagnosis during the infectious period (see below).

148 An infectious individual makes contacts with household members and persons outside the
149 household. We model the daily number of household contacts with a Poisson distribution,
150 and the numbers of non-household contacts with a negative binomial distribution (Table 1),
151 with parameters based on the average household size in the Netherlands, and numbers of
152 contacts observed in a contact study in the Netherlands (FigureS1b) [20]. With the chosen
153 parameters, the mean number of contacts per day is 13.2 (SD 8.5).

154 On each day of the infectious period, an individual makes a number of contacts according to
155 the contact distribution. This number is reduced by a factor describing the probability that
156 the contact person has already been infected during earlier contacts with the index person.
157 More precisely, the number of contacts is reduced by a factor f_k per day k of the infectious
158 period, describing the probability that a contact has already been infected on previous days
159 of the infectious period of the index case. The probability of transmission upon contact with
160 a susceptible household contact is given by the distribution in Figure S1a. As contacts with
161 persons outside the household are often less close, we assume that the transmission
162 probability for these contacts is lower by factor 0.25. Figure S1c shows the percentage of
163 onward transmissions per day of the infectious period, e.g. more than half of all onward
164 transmissions occur during the first 3 days of the infectious period.

165

166 **Social distancing**

167 Social distancing can be self-imposed, if people decide to reduce their social contacts during
168 the outbreak, and it can be government-imposed by closing schools, workplaces, and other
169 venues of social gatherings. Here we assume that when social distancing is applied,
170 household contacts remain unchanged, but the mean number of non-household contacts is

171 reduced. This is implemented by a reduction factor in the mean of the negative binomial
172 distribution describing non-household contact numbers. The reduction factor for social
173 distancing was varied between 0% and 95%. In scenarios with social distancing we assumed
174 that only 60% of cases are symptomatic or can be ascertained.

175

176 **Diagnosis, contact tracing, and isolation**

177 An infectious person becomes symptomatic with a given probability per day of the infectious
178 period. For SARS-CoV-2 the probability of developing symptoms is high in the first few days
179 of the infectious period. We assume that if an infected and infectious person has not
180 developed symptoms by day 6, the probability that he/she will still do so is very small. The
181 probability of developing symptoms determines whether he/she will be diagnosed and
182 isolated. The total probability of developing symptoms determines the fraction that remains
183 asymptomatic or otherwise undiagnosed, i.e. if the total probability of developing symptoms
184 is smaller than 1, a proportion of the infected persons will remain undiagnosed and can
185 transmit throughout their infectious period. With the assumed distributions, on average
186 about half of all potential onward transmissions will have occurred before an infected
187 person is diagnosed and isolated. The diagnosis can be delayed, which in the model is
188 implemented by setting the diagnosis probability to zero for the number of days of delay.
189 This delay describes the time between symptom onset until a symptomatic person visits a
190 GP or hospital and gets diagnosed.

191 If an individual is diagnosed, contacts will be traced, and in case they are infected will be
192 diagnosed and isolated. Tracing goes back in time to trace all contacts during the infectious
193 period of the index case. There may be a delay before contacts are found and diagnosed,

194 and only a fraction of all contacts may be found. These parameters, tracing delay and tracing
195 coverage, may be different for household and non-household contacts. We assume that all
196 traced infected persons are immediately isolated and cannot transmit any further.
197 Therefore, the only individuals who will continue transmitting are those who are not found
198 by tracing and are not yet diagnosed.

199

200 **Baseline scenario**

201 For assessing the effectiveness of contact tracing and isolation, we use a best case scenario,
202 where all parameters are set to optimistic values. We assume that when a case is diagnosed,
203 he/she will immediately be isolated and this will stop onward transmission completely.
204 Furthermore, we assume that all contacts will be traced, and if found infected will be
205 isolated immediately. We assume that it takes 1 day to find and isolate both household and
206 non-household contacts. The rationale for using these overly optimistic assumptions as a
207 baseline is that we want to investigate the maximum contribution contact tracing can
208 provide for achieving containment. In sensitivity analyses we investigated for various control
209 parameters at which point of diverging from the baseline parameters control of the
210 outbreak will be lost (Supplementary Information).

211

212 **Output variables**

213 We compute cumulative numbers of cases for a time period of 50 days after the epidemic
214 has reached more than 100 cases. We compare doubling time of the epidemic with only
215 isolation of diagnosed cases to situations with various levels of social distancing, isolation
216 and contact tracing. We assume that all diagnosed cases are isolated upon diagnosis and

cannot transmit further. We plot the epidemic from the time the cumulative number of infected persons is above 100. We compare these trajectories to similar trajectories for China, Germany, Italy, Japan, Turkey, and the US using data downloaded from ourworldindata.org [19]. We show what the additional contribution of isolation and contact tracing can be in the attempt to bend the curve towards longer doubling times.

The model allows an explicit calculation of the basic reproduction number R_0 and the effective reproduction number R_e [8]. R_0 is defined as the number of secondary cases an index case generates on average in a susceptible population, and R_e is the number of secondary infections per case when an intervention is in place. R_0 is determined by daily transmission probabilities and numbers of contacts. The effective reproduction number is in addition determined by the level of social distancing, diagnosis probabilities, tracing delays, and tracing coverages per day of the infectious period. We can therefore investigate how R_e depends on R_0 and on the intervention parameters.

We are interested in the critical tracing coverage, i.e. what proportion of non-household contacts needs to be found and isolated to control the outbreak, for populations with various levels of social distancing. Furthermore, we study the epidemic growth rate (or epidemic doubling time) without and with contact tracing and isolation and various levels of social distancing. In sensitivity analyses, we study how these quantities depend on the delay to diagnosis of cases and on the delay in contact tracing. For example, we assume that household contacts can be traced with a high coverage and without delay, but that tracing of non-household contact may take longer and be less complete.

Based on the distribution of the latent and infectious periods and infectivity, we calculate the exponential growth rate and doubling time under various assumptions on the intervention parameters. This gives additional information for situations where the outbreak

is not controllable, because intervention measures will lower the growth rate and increase the epidemic doubling time.

We investigate how controllability of the outbreak depends on the fraction of infections that develop symptoms and therefore vary this percentage between 0% and 100%. We then considered combinations of interventions and their impact on effective reproduction number, growth rate, and doubling time of the epidemic. We varied levels of social distancing, and coverage of tracing of household and non-household contacts. In our analysis for different levels of social distancing we assumed that 60% of infected persons develop symptoms.

Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit for publication. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and were responsible for the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Results

Basic and effective reproduction numbers

In the baseline scenario without interventions we calibrate the transmission probability such that the basic reproduction number equals $R_0 = 2.5$. In that case, 39% of transmissions take

place among household contacts. The basic reproduction number of household contacts is 0.97, and that of non-household contacts 1.53. Hence, if all non-household transmissions could be prevented, the outbreak would be just under the control limit. In the baseline scenario without interventions the exponential growth rate is 0.19 per day and the doubling time is 3.6 days, which agrees with published estimates [13]. For sensitivity analysis of the relation between R_0 and R_e for various combinations of parameters, see the Supplementary Information.

Outbreak doubling times

Isolation of diagnosed cases alone reduces the doubling time to almost 4 days. If social distancing is implemented 28 days after the first case was diagnosed, and the number of non-household contacts is reduced by 70% [21], the doubling time will increase to around 14 days (Figure 1a). The figure also shows that it takes a week before the impact on the epidemic growth starts to be visible. If higher levels of social distancing can be achieved, the doubling times can be increased more (Figure 1b), but even for 90% reduction of contacts the curve has not been flattened. In Figure 1c the impact of the timing of social distancing measures on the further course of the outbreak is shown. The figure demonstrates how every week delay in implementing these measures leads to an order of magnitude higher numbers of cases, thus emphasizing the importance of fast implementation of social distancing measures. Finally, in Figure 4d we show a scenario where social distancing is implemented at day 28 after diagnosing the first case and reduces non-household contacts by 70%. Then at day 49, also contact tracing is implemented. It is assumed that all infected household contacts and 50% of the non-household contacts of a newly diagnosed case are traced and isolated. This additional measure increases the doubling time to … days. We

285 contrast this scenario with data from epidemics in a number of countries that have
286 implemented social distancing at various levels and time points.

287

288 **Fraction of non-household contacts needed to trace and isolate**

289 If there is a diagnosis delay, the question arises how successful contact tracing has to be to
290 keep the outbreak under control. We therefore compute the minimum fraction of non-
291 household contacts that need to be traced and isolated (henceforth termed "critical tracing
292 coverage") to bring R_e to below 1 (for examples with various assumptions on timeliness of
293 contact tracing see Supplementary Information).

294

295 **Impact of asymptomatic cases**

296 Not being diagnosed can be a consequence of not developing symptoms, having only mild
297 symptoms, or any other reason why infected persons might not be identified by health care.
298 We subsume these possible reasons for cases not being ascertained under the term
299 "asymptomatic". With increasing proportion of asymptomatic cases, the possibility of
300 controlling the outbreak with contact tracing and isolation quickly fades. This is shown in
301 Figure 2, where we plotted the critical tracing coverage for non-household contacts for
302 several values of R_0 as a function of the fraction of symptomatic cases (i.e. the fraction of
303 those who will eventually develop symptoms during their entire infectious period).
304 Household contacts are assumed to be always traced and isolated. The figure shows that for
305 $R_0 = 2.5$ control is not possible with isolation and contact tracing, if less than 60% of all
306 infected persons develop symptoms or are otherwise not detected by the health care

system, even if all other parameters are at the most optimistic values. Other interventions measures such as social distancing are then needed for containment of the outbreak.

Social distancing and contact tracing

Social distancing in theory can reduce the effective reproduction number to below 1, but only if non-household contacts are almost reduced to zero. In reality this is not possible, because there are many non-household contacts which cannot be avoided to keep essential processes in society going. Therefore social distancing will not be complete and may not be sufficient for containment. Additional tracing and isolation of household contacts may then be the additional effort needed to achieve containment. In figure 3a we show for various levels of social distancing, expressed as proportion reduction of non-household contacts, what fraction of household- or additionally non-household contacts need to be traced and isolated to reduce the effective reproduction number. Similarly, figure 3b shows the increase of the doubling time that can be achieved with these contact tracing measures depending on level of social distancing. Figure 4a shows for various values of R_0, what are the critical tracing coverages of household contacts only in order to reach an effective reproduction number of 1, which is the threshold to containment. If tracing household contacts is not sufficient, also non-household contacts have to be traced and isolated, for which the critical coverages are shown in figure 4b. For example, if social distancing leads to a reduction of 50% of non-household contacts, additional tracing and isolating household contacts can further reduce the effective reproduction number, but cannot achieve

329 containment. If then also 20% of non-household contacts can be traced and isolated, the
330 transition to containment can be made.
331

332 Discussion

333 Our analyses show that rapid diagnosis and isolation of infections based on COVID-19
334 disease alone cannot control outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2, but that the addition of tracing and
335 isolation of traced cases could in theory be successful depending on the value of R_0
336 (Figure 2). In practice, however, the potential for containment will be seriously jeopardized
337 by various delays and imperfections in the tracing process. Especially delays in diagnosis and
338 isolation, and the existence of asymptomatic and mild infections that contribute to onward
339 transmission will make an outbreak uncontrollable. As evidence is mounting that the
340 proportion of asymptomatic and mild cases is large and leads to substantial numbers of
341 unascertained cases [22], most countries have now switched to strategies of social
342 distancing or complete lockdowns. Such measures have proven effective earlier during the
343 2009 influenza pandemic [23, 24]. However, social distancing can never be complete, as
344 healthcare workers and doctors have to continue their work, but also personnel of
345 supermarkets, public transport employees, and others need to have contact outside their
346 households. Therefore, transmission chains may remain. We find that in a situation where
347 60% of cases are ascertained, social distancing of non-household contacts fails to contain
348 the epidemic even if contacts outside the household are reduced by 80%. In that case,
349 combining the social distancing with tracing and isolation of household contacts may suffice
350 to bring the balance towards containment. If social distancing is less severe, more intensive
351 contact tracing and also tracing of non-household contacts is needed (Figures 3 and 4). If

352 social distancing reduces non-household contacts only by 50%, tracing and isolation also of
353 non-household contacts is needed for containment. If this is not possible, for example due
354 to constraints of the public health system, tracing and isolation of household contacts can at
355 least substantially increase the doubling time of the epidemic (Figure 3b).

356

357 In the recent report by Ferguson and colleagues (https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-
358 infectious-disease-analysis/news--wuhan-coronavirus/) it is assumed that non-household
359 contacts would be reduced by 75% by social distancing [25], and a contact study in the UK
360 shows that numbers of contacts are reduced by around 73% [21]. Using these estimates, our
361 model predicts that additional tracing and isolation of infected household contacts would
362 suffice as an additional measure to achieve containment. Possibly, this could be achieved by
363 using digital tracing applications as implemented in South Korea, where it has apparently
364 helped to bring the epidemic under control [3].

365

366 Even though the pandemic situation shows that COVID-19 epidemics cannot be contained by
367 contact tracing and rapid isolation alone, this does not render contact tracing useless. On
368 the contrary, contact tracing and isolation when used in addition to social distancing, may be
369 the tool needed to make this mix of strategies successful. Our analyses show that isolation
370 and contact tracing when combined with social distancing can contribute to reducing the
371 growth rate and increasing the doubling time of epidemics, thereby buying time, spreading
372 the number of severe cases out over a longer period of time, and potentially also reducing
373 the total number of infections (the “final size”) [26]. This will lower peak healthcare demand,
374 alleviate the stress on healthcare systems, and contribute to reducing the burden of disease.

Our analyses of contact tracing add to an earlier study by a more systematic analysis of the relation between key parameters (transmissibility, fraction asymptomatic, fraction of contacts traced, diagnosis delays), and by incorporating household versus non-household contacts [27]. Household contacts are at a higher risk of becoming infected than non-household contacts as persons in a household will usually have repeated contacts. On the other hand, our analyses show that household infections contribute less to onward transmission than non-household infections simply because the numbers of household contacts are much lower than numbers of other contacts. As a consequence, the effectiveness in isolating non-household contacts is key for a successful contact tracing strategy.

A strength of the model is that quantitative information about distributions of the latent and infectious periods, and the infectivity per day of the infectious period can be incorporated easily and detailed, such that if new and better data on those quantities emerge, the analysis can be updated quickly. In particular, the model can incorporate non-standard distributions based on empirical data (e.g. viral load measurements to quantify infectiousness per day), should they become available.

A limitation of the analyses presented here is that they apply to a situation in which the epidemic is described by a branching process and is growing exponentially. This also applies to another modelling using a (one-type) branching process.[27] Ultimately, as the number of persons who are or have been infected increases, the number of persons that are still

susceptible will start to dwindle, and epidemic growth will ultimately come to a halt. Hence, strictly speaking our results apply to the early stages of an epidemic. In fact, even when the number of infected persons is still relatively small in the early stage of an epidemic it is possible that exponential growth is not observed, for instance due to local depletion of susceptible persons in combination with clustering in contact patterns, spatial effects, and inhomogeneous mixing [28]. However, estimates of the effective reproduction number are independent of the dynamics and give information about the ability of an intervention to stop of slow down epidemic spread. Also, at present the epidemics in many countries are still growing exponentially [19].

In conclusion, our results show that in populations where social distancing is implemented, isolation and contact tracing can play an essential role in gaining control of the COVID-19 epidemic. On their own, none of these strategies are able to contain COVID-19 for realistic parameter settings, but in a combined strategy they can just tip the balance towards containment. These insights provide guidance for policy makers, who will have to decide when and how to release severe lockdown or social distancing measures, and whether additional contact tracing and isolation is then a feasible alternative keep a resurging epidemic at bay.

Contributors

MEK, MvB, and GR conceived the study. MK designed and programmed the model, and produced output. All authors interpreted the results, contributed to writing the manuscript, and approved the final version for submission.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Tables

Table 1: Disease and transmission related parameters.

Parameter	Distribution/values	Reference
Latent period	1-3 days	**[29]**
Infectious period	10 days	**[29]**
Incubation period	Weibull(3.0, 7.2) mean: 6.4 (day) sd: 2.3 (day)	[10]
Number of household contacts	Poisson(2.15) mean: 2.15 (day^{-1})	https://www.statista.com/statistics/521777/netherlands-average-household-size-by-number-of-residents/
Number of non-household contacts	NB(2, 0.15)* mean: 11.3 (day^{-1}) sd: 8.7 (day^{-1})	[20]
Reduction factor of transmissibility for non-household contacts	0.25	[30]
Transmission probability per contact		calibrated such that R_0=2.5

432 Table 2: Parameters related to diagnosis and contact tracing.

Parameter	Value/range	Reference
Delay until diagnosis of index case	Baseline: 1 day; varied from 1 to 10 days	[13] [31]
Time needed to find household contacts	Baseline: 1 day	
Time needed to find other contacts	Baseline: 1 day; varied from 1 to 7 days	[32] [33]
Percentage of household contacts isolated	Baseline: 100%; not varied in this analysis	
Proportion of other contacts isolated	Varied from 0% to 100%	
Percentage symptomatic (also interpretable as ascertainment rate)	Baseline: 100%; varied from 1.5% to 100%	
Percentage reduction contact rate outside the household	Baseline: 0%; varied from 0% to 95%	

433

434

References

1. Bernard Stoecklin S, Rolland P, Silue Y, Mailles A, Campese C, Simondon A, et al. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in France: surveillance, investigations and control measures, January 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(6). Epub 2020/02/20. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.6.2000094. PubMed PMID: 32070465.
2. Anderson RM, Heesterbeek H, Klinkenberg D, Hollingsworth TD. How will country-based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? The Lancet. 2020;395(10228):931-4. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30567-5.
3. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. Science. 2020:eabb6936. doi: 10.1126/science.abb6936.
4. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. Ann Intern Med. 2020. Epub 2020/03/10. doi: 10.7326/M20-0504. PubMed PMID: 32150748.
5. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, Ng T-C, Huang W-T, Lin H-H. High transmissibility of COVID-19 near symptom onset. medRxiv. 2020:2020.03.18.20034561. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.18.20034561.
6. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, Ferguson NM. Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak controllable. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2004;101(16):6146-51. Epub 2004/04/09. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0307506101. PubMed PMID: 15071187; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC395937.
7. Klinkenberg D, Fraser C, Heesterbeek H. The effectiveness of contact tracing in emerging epidemics. PLoS One. 2006;1:e12. Epub 2006/12/22. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0000012. PubMed PMID: 17183638; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1762362.
8. Kretzschmar M, van den Hof S, Wallinga J, van Wijngaarden J. Ring vaccination and smallpox control. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004;10(5):832-41. Epub 2004/06/18. doi: 10.3201/eid1005.030419. PubMed PMID: 15200816; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3323203.
9. Muller J, Kretzschmar M, Dietz K. Contact tracing in stochastic and deterministic epidemic models. Math Biosci. 2000;164(1):39-64. Epub 2000/03/08. doi: 10.1016/s0025-5564(99)00061-9. PubMed PMID: 10704637.
10. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(5). Epub 2020/02/13. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062. PubMed PMID: 32046819.
11. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. Lancet. 2020;395(10223):507-13. Epub 2020/02/03. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7. PubMed PMID: 32007143.
12. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet. 2020;395(10223):497-506. Epub 2020/01/28. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5. PubMed PMID: 31986264.
13. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. N Engl J Med. 2020. Epub 2020/01/30. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316. PubMed PMID: 31995857.
14. Riou J, Althaus CL. Pattern of early human-to-human transmission of Wuhan 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV), December 2019 to January 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(4). Epub 2020/02/06. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.4.2000058. PubMed PMID: 32019669; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7001239.
15. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, et al. Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. N Engl J Med. 2020. Epub 2020/02/01. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2001468. PubMed PMID: 32003551.

16. Tang B, Wang X, Li Q, Bragazzi NL, Tang S, Xiao Y, et al. Estimation of the Transmission Risk of the 2019-nCoV and Its Implication for Public Health Interventions. J Clin Med. 2020;9(2). Epub 2020/02/13. doi: 10.3390/jcm9020462. PubMed PMID: 32046137.
17. Keeling MJ, Hollingsworth TD, Read JM. The Efficacy of Contact Tracing for the Containment of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19). medRxiv. 2020:2020.02.14.20023036. doi: 10.1101/2020.02.14.20023036.
18. Dodd PJ, White PJ, Garnett GP. Notions of synergy for combinations of interventions against infectious diseases in heterogeneously mixing populations. Mathematical biosciences. 2010;227(2):94-104. Epub 2010/07/01. doi: 10.1016/j.mbs.2010.06.004. PubMed PMID: 20600157.
19. Our world in data. 2020 [1 April 2020]. Available from: https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus
20. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. PLoS Med. 2008;5(3):e74. Epub 2008/03/28. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074. PubMed PMID: 18366252; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2270306.
21. Jarvis CI, van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Prem K, Klepac P, Rubin GJ, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmissionof COVID-19 in the UK. CMMID Repository2020.
22. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2). Science. 2020:eabb3221. doi: 10.1126/science.abb3221.
23. Cauchemez S, Ferguson NM, Wachtel C, Tegnell A, Saour G, Duncan B, et al. Closure of schools during an influenza pandemic. Lancet Infect Dis. 2009;9(8):473-81. Epub 2009/07/25. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(09)70176-8. PubMed PMID: 19628172.
24. Te Beest DE, Birrell PJ, Wallinga J, De Angelis D, van Boven M. Joint modelling of serological and hospitalization data reveals that high levels of pre-existing immunity and school holidays shaped the influenza A pandemic of 2009 in the Netherlands. J R Soc Interface. 2015;12(103). Epub 2014/12/30. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2014.1244. PubMed PMID: 25540241; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4305427.
25. Mahase E. Covid-19: UK starts social distancing after new model points to 260 000 potential deaths. BMJ. 2020;368:m1089. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1089.
26. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek H, Britton T. Mathematical Tools for Understanding Infectious Disease Dynamics: Princeton University Press; 2013.
27. Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, Bosse NI, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, et al. Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. Lancet Glob Health. 2020. Epub 2020/03/03. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30074-7. PubMed PMID: 32119825.
28. Chowell G, Viboud C, Simonsen L, Moghadas SM. Characterizing the reproduction number of epidemics with early subexponential growth dynamics. J R Soc Interface. 2016;13(123). Epub 2016/10/07. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2016.0659. PubMed PMID: 27707909; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5095223.
29. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and Transmission of COVID-19 in Shenzhen China: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. medRxiv. 2020:2020.03.03.20028423. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.03.20028423.
30. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KK, Chu H, Yang J, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. Lancet. 2020;395(10223):514-23. Epub 2020/01/28. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30154-9. PubMed PMID: 31986261.
31. Donnelly CA, Ghani AC, Leung GM, Hedley AJ, Fraser C, Riley S, et al. Epidemiological determinants of spread of causal agent of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. Lancet. 2003;361(9371):1761-6. Epub 2003/06/05. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(03)13410-1. PubMed PMID: 12781533.
32. Baker MG, Thornley CN, Mills C, Roberts S, Perera S, Peters J, et al. Transmission of pandemic A/H1N1 2009 influenza on passenger aircraft: retrospective cohort study. BMJ. 2010;340:c2424.

536 Epub 2010/05/25. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c2424. PubMed PMID: 20495017; PubMed Central PMCID:
537 PMCPMC2874661.
538 33. Swaan CM, Appels R, Kretzschmar ME, van Steenbergen JE. Timeliness of contact tracing among
539 flight passengers for influenza A/H1N1 2009. BMC Infect Dis. 2011;11:355. Epub 2011/12/30. doi:
540 10.1186/1471-2334-11-355. PubMed PMID: 22204494; PubMed Central PMCID:
541 PMCPMC3265549.

542

Figure legends

Figure 1: The cumulative number of cases in an outbreak shown from the time when the number of cases exceeds 100. In (A) the mean and standard deviation of 20 simulation runs is shown for a situation where up to day 28 after the first case was diagnosed, only diagnosis and case isolation is implemented. At day 28 after diagnosis of the first case (arrow) social distancing was implemented, which reduced the number of non-household contacts by 70%. In (B) simulations are shown with varying levels of social distancing (contact reductions of 0%, 30%, 50%, 70%, 80%, 90%; colors from brown to red). In (C) social distancing is implemented at the level of 70% reduction at different times after the diagnosis of the first case (2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 weeks, see arrows). In (D) a scenario is shown (red dotted line) with implementation of social distancing at a contact reduction of 70% (red arrow) at day 28; additional contact tracing and isolation and quarantine of contacts starts at day 49 (orange arrow) after diagnosis of the first case. We contrast this scenario with data from outbreaks in several countries that have implemented social distancing at various levels and times during the outbreak.

Figure 2: The critical tracing coverage needed for control of the outbreak for varying percentages of asymptomatic infections and values of R_0 between 1.5 and 3.5. If more than 40% of cases escape diagnosis because they are asymptomatic or have only mild infections, for R0 = 2.5 the outbreak is not controllable even with our optimistic baseline values for the intervention parameters.

Figure 3: The additional impact of isolation and contact tracing in a population where social distancing is practiced on (A) the exponential growth rate and (B) the doubling time of the epidemic. The additional impact of tracing and isolating household contacts only is shown in the curves from green to yellow (tracing coverage varying from 0% to 100%). If 100% of household contacts are traced and isolated, additional benefit is gained with tracing also non-household contact with increasing tracing coverage shown colored blue to pink (varying from 0% to 100%). In these computations we assumed that 60% of cases are ascertained and R_0=2.5.

Figure 4: The critical tracing coverages required for containment in a population with social distancing. In (A) the critical tracing coverage is shown if only household contacts are traced and isolated. In (B) the tracing of household contacts is assumed to be 100% and the curves show the additional tracing of non-household contacts needed to achieve containment. Again 60% of cases are assumed to be ascertained and tracing coverages are shown for various values of R_0.

Figure 1


A
3.6
3.9
13.7
cumulative number cases
time (days)
1 × 10^5
5 × 10^4
1 × 10^4
5000
1000
500
100
0
10
20
30
40
50


B
1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
6.0
9.0
14.0
cumulative number cases
time (days)
1 × 10^5
5 × 10^4
1 × 10^4
5000
1000
500
100
0
10
20
30
40
50


C
1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
6.0
9.0
14.0
cumulative number cases
time (days)


D
1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
simulation
6.0
9.0
14.0
cumulative number cases
time (days)
China
Germany
Italy
Japan
Turkey
United States

Figure 2


Critical tracing coverage
fraction symptomatic
R_0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0

Figure 3


A
B
growth rate (days^{-1})
0.10
0.05
0.00
−0.05
0
20
40
60
80
100
contact reduction (%)
doubling time (days)
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
0
20
40
60
80
100
contact reduction (%)

Figure 4


A
B
Critical tracing coverage
contact reduction (%)
R_0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
0
20
40
60
80
100